



neverhadaboss.com

updates on the insane world of money and power

*When Those Who Created the Problem—Try to Fix the Problem*

An interesting article in the JPR, public radio magazine (my wife gets), about homelessness in Oregon. After DC/California, Oregon is home to the most homeless. Offering historical insight, the piece addressed how, during the housing boom, low-cost rooms for itinerant poor were bulldozed. Adding to that, mental illness has ramped-up.

NPR's case for the cause of Oregon's homelessness is underfunded and understaffed housing programs. For homeless blacks they blame addiction to heroin and lost ability to rely on families for support. This is likely the case—but likely not the cause.

You gotta give the dems, at least their support base, a nod for compassion. That's what they vote for—without realizing they are being used. But, in that equation, the primary cause is missed, something they do not understand—the role of productivity.

Take the issue of black men and heroin addiction: blacks have suffered as 'low man on the totem pole'—criminalized and incarcerated for their addiction. So, why are their families in no condition to offer these men refuge? The welfare state was the cause, when they drove black men out of the household—out into desperation and addiction.

Do-gooders, with their compassion intact, but relying on government for their own wellbeing, and without historical perspective, are forced to rely on government to fix it. They don't make the connection: 'those who made the problem don't know how to fix it'.

Instead, they rely on 'democracy' to fix it—democracy where we elect legislators (often for life), and then don't bother with what those legislators do until the next election. These are the same voters who (maybe out of a sense of compassion), vote to give 'the executive' more power to fix problems, or vote for a president who already has shown willingness to circumvent constitutional 'checks/balances' for his/her own ends.

Then, voters, seeing their tax dollars disappearing down 'the rabbit hole', 1st grumble, then refuse to pay that portion of a tax they see as counterproductive. The Oregon Legislature explains that phenomena in this manner: *The real concern is that having the ability of opting out of some taxes undermines what 'the people' voted for. People can pick and choose what they will fund regardless of what their neighbors voted for?*

Adherence to a concept of democracy (where your neighbors decide for you), describes 'mob rule'—not in keeping with a vision our 'founders' gave us—for a republic.

A republic is much like the 1st Amendment: 'Government shall not', wherein citizens hold a great share of power and the federal government is mandated only a few pow-

ers. And though things proceed much slower when citizens need 'to be gotten on board' for taxing proposals, curtailing the scope of government is an ultimate good.

When government, through adventurism, cronyism, or 'let the neighbors decide your fate' democracy, sets its own limits, that is a recipe for tyranny. On the other hand, a government based on the model of the US Constitution, with checks and balances, checks government overreach and slows mechanisms of government—all to good end.

Using constitutional remedies (laws and amendments), the US was able to address right to vote, slavery, segregation. So, how did it happen that the 'law of the land' was 'laid low'? Did it find a beginning with Lincoln (no advocate for blacks), disallowing the South to succeed? Did he set a precedent for federal supremacy over states/citizens?

Then FDR, dictating that Woodrow Wilson's adventurism, which brought about the Great Depression, would be dealt with through socialism. Did handing-over citizen's/state's rights to a popular despot who assumed he knew best how to fix things—do it?

It's not that the 'compassionate left' are wrong, it's more that they do not understand human nature. When they remind us that Nixon issued a moratorium on public housing, that's true, but at the same time Nixon was bankrupting the US waging massive war with spent bombs over Laos/Cambodia—with nothing to show but increased debt.

Despotic control is an incremental thing that can be tracked—focusing on 2 things. 1st are 'power seekers' that we had from the beginning: advocates for a central bank and expansion of power beyond our borders. The 'founders' had, by design, made certain that 'adventurism;' was curtailed by strict adherence to 'sound money'-gold/silver. Without unbridled credit/taxpayer debt, power brokers were held in check—by gold.

So, what is 'sound money', and what are it's characteristics? It's precious—not found in great abundance. It's difficult to acquire, to gather, even in small amounts, whether from a creek-bed or a lifetime of toil. And it's always the same, recognized everywhere and valued by history/nations, as the measure for trade, foreign and domestic—gold.

Gold is unique among all things. Well, maybe not all? One of the 1st coins showed a rendering of a 'bee'. Something about bees correlates with money? And that thing that bees produce, honey, does it bear resemblance/comparison to 'sound money'—gold?

Honey is rare, requiring hard work to produce. A bee, over its entire life span (40-some days), produces 1 teaspoon of honey—enough to keep a man alive for 24 hours. And honey has no expiration date. Great emperors were buried in gold coffins, covered in honey to prevent putrefaction. Honey and gold share a few basic characteristics?

Put gold aside for 1000 years and it remains the same. Honey is not immortal but can remain viable for decades. Gold, like honey sustains life, and preserves our future.

A playful comparison intended to show why gold has been, is, and will be the measure of currencies/trade for a foreseeable future. And unlike crypto (if it proves a store of value), gold is real, something beautiful and intrinsic to life. Also its little brother, silver, comes with a more tarnished history, while sharing genetics with its big brother.

The progression toward tyranny is much advanced, and without bloodshed will likely not be turned back. Short of that, here's what I do. Years ago, I traded my bank account for silver that I bought at around \$12. Which means that any time I sell an ounce, the interest on my account has more than doubled the deposit. That's sound money.

Here I am now, beyond my cash limit of \$10,000, looking at more silver. I don't want a bunch of cash to buy-up what others lose—I want to be safe from those trying to fit it.

Get my articles by email with a request: erik@neverhadaboss.com. And thank you.